



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

engaged in making surveys, estimating the cost of construction, etc., shall have made its report.

In the matter of international bimetalism, the President earnestly hopes that the labors of the Commission, whose efforts have been thought by many to have signally failed, "may result in an international agreement which will bring about recognition of both gold and silver as money upon such terms and with such safeguards as will secure the use of both metals upon a basis which shall work no injustice to any class of our citizens."

As to our trade relations with other nations the message states that Hon. John A. Kasson has been appointed a special commissioner to negotiate with foreign countries desiring to avail themselves of the reciprocity provisions of the new tariff law. The negotiations are now proceeding with several governments. The President advises the enlargement and improvement of our merchant marine. "The government by every proper constitutional means should aid in making our ships familiar visitors at every commercial port of the world."

The message alludes briefly to the negotiations now going on in reference to the seal question, the result of which it is hoped may soon be reported to Congress.

No passage in the message says as much in as few words as that relating to arbitration. President McKinley has put admirably into four sentences what he told the Mohonk Arbitration Conference Committee he would say. It is not unlikely that in the near future there will be such developments in the matter of an Anglo-American treaty that the President will send to the Senate a special message on the subject. For this further and fuller treatment, the declaration in the recent message, which we quote in full, is an excellent prelude:

"International arbitration can not be omitted from the list of subjects claiming our consideration. Events have only served to strengthen the general views on this question expressed in my inaugural address. The best sentiment of the civilized world is moving toward the settlement of differences between nations without resorting to the horrors of war. Treaties embodying these humane principles on broad lines, without in any way imperiling our interest or our honor, shall have my constant encouragement."

The Annexation of Hawaii.

Before Congress met last month it was considered certain that the treaty for the annexation of Hawaii would go through the Senate with flying colors, possibly within a week after that body re-assembled. But when the Senate came together it was soon discovered that the treaty could not certainly muster in its favor a two-thirds majority of the Senators. Later a canvass showed that thirty-nine Senators were opposed to annexation. When Mr. Hoar presented to the Senate the petition of the native Hawaiians, signed by 21,000 or two-thirds of the whole number of pure natives, protesting against annexation, the effect both on the Senate and the country was such as to make it practically certain that the treaty will never come to a vote.

The only way left, therefore, by which the advocates of annexation can hope to accomplish their purpose is through a joint resolution, as in the case of Texas. It is considered doubtful if even in this way the project can be gotten through the Senate. There is known to be much opposition to annexation in the House. In any event, the scheme can not now be railroaded through. Debate on it is, we think, sure to increase opposition, rather than diminish it, in both Houses, and debate is certain to arise when the subject comes up. Opinion throughout the country seems not very materially to have changed, tho doubt of the desirability of annexation is certainly stronger to-day than it has before been since President Harrison presented the first annexation treaty. The sentimental clamor for annexation is evidently waning. As this is probably the last opportunity we shall have of discussing the subject before it is finally disposed of, we deem it proper to rehearse the reasons given pro and con and to restate our position.

The arguments in favor of annexation, so far as we have seen them, are these:

Hawaii has asked to be annexed to this country; we ought not to refuse to incorporate with us a people which desires to become one with us.

It is the duty of the United States to extend its free institutions to other quarters of the globe wherever possible.

The colony of Americans in Hawaii, now the rulers of the country, deserve our support in their efforts to preserve and promote American civilization, which they and their ancestors have planted

there. They can not long maintain it in present circumstances without annexation.

The Sandwich islands are of great value to us commercially, and this value would be much heightened by annexation.

We need the control of Hawaii in order to keep our commerce free and unrestricted in all quarters of the Pacific.

We need the islands for a coaling station and a centre of naval defense against attacks on our Pacific coast.

If we do not annex Hawaii, Japan or Great Britain or some other nation will. The present government can not continue to maintain its independence.

Japan is becoming a great sea power, is in danger of controlling the Pacific, and may sometime make a descent upon us. We must be forearmed against her by taking Hawaii.

The "logic" of our historical relations to Hawaii demands annexation. Very much the same as this is the "manifest destiny" argument.

These arguments have been variously expanded and hammered in with all sorts of high-sounding, pious, "patriotic" and scarecrow phrases. We know of no reason that has been given in favor of annexation which can not be reduced to one of these, unless we consider as a different argument the statement that it is the duty of America (the United States) to "expand" and "take" anywhere and everywhere "what we need (want)."

The counter contentions may be briefly stated as follows:

Only a small portion of the population of the islands, less than 4,000 out of a total of 109,000, have expressed their wish to be annexed to this government. The native Hawaiians, more than two-thirds of them in a written memorial, protest against annexation. It is contrary to all the principles of our national life to force the great majority of the population into union with us without giving them a chance to declare their wish.

The present government of the islands is an oligarchy, though in republican form, which came into existence in a revolutionary way with the naval aid of the United States. To annex the islands, in the interests of this commercial oligarchy, without consulting the rest of the population, would be adding wrong to wrong.

It is not the duty of the United States to extend its free institutions by methods which trample under foot the very principles on which our civilization is built.

Commercially, annexation would be of advantage to the sugar-planters of Hawaii, by removing all tariffs at our ports. It would be of no appreciable

advantage to this country, which is naturally and always will be the chief foreign market for Hawaiian productions.

As to the freedom of our commerce in all parts of the Pacific, there will not be the least trouble if we behave ourselves and show ourselves reasonable, just and fair towards others.

There is no evidence that Great Britain or Japan or any other nation is secretly planning or intending to annex the islands if we do not.

The idea that Japan has any purpose to attack us on our western coast is pure, even ridiculous fancy.

The possession of Hawaii by some other nation would not in the least endanger us. No nation has the remotest intention of attacking us. If such were the fact, the greatness of our territory, the size of our population, the inexhaustibleness of our resources, render us practically invulnerable, certainly impregnable.

We are and shall be even more capable of dictating the independence of Hawaii than we have been in the past. Our simple word is all that is needed.

Our historic relations to these Pacific islands point logically to independence and not to annexation. As to "manifest destiny" that is a dark word of political sorcery, that may have any meaning which an aggressive "expansionist" wishes to give to it.

The mixed population of the islands, with its various un-American characteristics, is at the present time entirely unsuited to United States citizenship. Annexation would occasion difficult and vexatious problems of government, especially since we have no system of colonial administration.

Annexation would be the inauguration of a policy which would weaken our Continental security. It would require a large increase in our navy. Hawaii would have to be fortified and strongly garrisoned. In case of war, instead of being a defense, it would be the one weak point inviting attack. We should therefore be embarked on a system of naval extension, which would not only be overwhelmingly expensive but would inevitably lead to entangling relations with the great naval powers. It would be the gateway for the final and full introduction of the system of European militarism, of which we are in no small danger already. The whole system of American civil and religious liberty would thus be imperiled before an all-devouring militarism, against which, until recently, our nation has always stood.

Some of these arguments against annexation are of no great force, when taken alone, and can be answered with tolerable satisfaction by those who favor taking Hawaii in; yet the united force of the several different contentions, especially the two or three last given, makes the case against annexation so strong as to be practically irrefutable. We very

much hope this view may prevail in Congress, in whatever form the subject may be brought forward after the holidays. We do not say that the time will never come when it may be right and expedient to make this group of islands a part of our domain. But at the present time it seems to us clear that it is neither right nor expedient, but unwise and dangerous from the standpoint both of our private national interests and of our great duty to try to bring the world to a higher standard of righteous and peaceful living.

A Mongolian Invasion.

In an otherwise able and admirable statement of the reasons for an Anglo-American Arbitration treaty, published in the papers on December 17th, Mr. William Randal Cremer, now in Washington in the interests of such a treaty, gave the following argument for a federation of the Anglo-Saxon race, which we regret very much that he should have used in such a connection :

“There are strong arguments, however, for a federation of the Anglo-Saxon race, and I am glad to note that there are men on both sides of the water who are alive to the enormous danger that confronts both branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. As you are aware, the great supply of cotton, which your Southern States used to furnish us with, was practically cut off by your civil war. It occasioned terrible suffering in our cotton manufacturing districts, thousands of cotton operatives in Lancashire and Cheshire being reduced to misery and starvation. Being deprived of the Southern supply, we turned to India, and since then India has supplied us with a large quantity of cotton. At first it was a very inferior grade, known as Surrat, which the operatives disliked to handle. It reminds me of a story John Bright told me. He said that during the cotton famine a good divine was invoking heaven for more abundant supplies of cotton, when one of the operatives called out : ‘Yes, O Lord, grant our prayer, but please don’t send us Surrat.’” These poorer grades have now given way to high grade cottons, and many factories have been transferred from Lancashire and Cheshire to Bombay and Calcutta. Perhaps it is unpatriotic, but capital is not sentimental. It found in India the raw material, and labor at a few pence a day as against fifteen to twenty shillings per week in England. As a result India is growing cotton, and Indian operatives are manufacturing it. But the great danger to which I alluded is the solid advances and growing power of the Mongolian races. America and Great Britain have taught them the

useful arts, and unfortunately the art of destruction. Having done so, they are meeting us on more than equal terms in the markets of the world. Their goods are overrunning Europe and America. The Japanese have entered our workshops and learned our trades, only to go back and produce goods at half the price that we can. They are also skilled — especially the Japanese — in the science of naval warfare. They build ironclads, make guns, and with their countless millions of population it will take the united energies of the Anglo-Saxon races to compete with the Japanese and the Chinese in the markets of the world, and prevent them from swarming over the continents of Europe and America. Is not that an argument for a federation between the branches of the Anglo-Saxon race — a federation that will arrest this rapid spread of the Mongolian races ?”

Mr. Cremer does not put forth these considerations as a direct argument for a treaty of arbitration, but he evidently meant by them to remove objections to a treaty on the part of a certain class of our Senators and citizens. Their dislike of Great Britain was to be quieted by an appeal to the dread of a Mongolian invasion. If the statement given in the citation properly reports Mr. Cremer, we regret very much that one who is working for the high and unselfish cause of arbitration and for ultimate peace between all nations, should have allowed himself to resort to a narrow, selfish, unpacific argument which smacks of political shrewdness of no high order. The sort of federation here argued for, if the argument means anything, is both commercial and political. The commercial federation, if devised to keep back the spread of the Mongolian commerce, would have to have in it a prohibitive provision towards those races. Beyond that, any federation of Great Britain and the United States to “arrest this rapid spread of the Mongolian races” would have to be in the form of a defensive military alliance and a joint restrictive immigration law, the latter at any rate.

Now, there is no possible connection between an arbitration treaty and such a federation as Mr. Cremer hints at. An arbitration treaty proposes simply to secure the peaceful judicial settlement of difficulties between the two nations ; nothing more. In respect to all other matters each nation would be absolutely free and untrammelled. If the suspicion should go out that the friends of Anglo-American permanent arbitration had in view to bring about thereby an Anglo-American federation, in any sense against other nations, incalculable injury would